

PMT Technical Comments on Fresno Street Construction Plans and Specifications by Caltrans

- The retaining walls below the HST alignment shall be designed to accommodate the future HST grade separation structure.
- Ensure integration of the local street alignment and improvements and with the HSR alignment and overpass structures.
- RFP Addenda drawing ST-K1004-A2 indicate the proposed HST overpass structure is a two-cell box culvert that is not accommodated in Caltrans' the Fresno Street design.
- Caltrans proposed retaining walls (Nos. 1 & 5 and 2 & 6) do not account for a cut-and-cover Fresno Street overpass box currently shown in CP1 Addendum 2. The retaining walls design shall accommodate the future HST structures.
- Survey control used for construction of Fresno Street work shall be same as CHSTP primary and secondary survey control.
- Ensure integration between HSR CP1 and Caltrans Fresno Street Plan to resolve inconsistencies in design.
- The "F" line for High Speed Rail does not match that shown on CHSTP Drawing No. ST-K1004-A2 (Addendum 2 - RFP HSR 11-16).
- The layout of the abutment for high-speed rail bridge shown on the drawing is not consistent with CHSTP preliminary design drawings where a cut-and-cover box structure is proposed at the Fresno Street underpass.
- The HST control line is "S2", not "F", and "S2" is the southbound track centerline, not centerline between the two tracks.
- Confirm design matches the aesthetic treatment of the retaining walls and G St Bridge.
- Limits of work shown on the layout sheet are not consistent with the limits shown on the Title Sheet.
- HST "S" has been revised (i.e. stationing, bearings, length of tangent, etc). Incorporate the latest HST alignment as well as last proposed HST right-of-way information. Update station equation for "FFS" line and HST alignment "S" line.
- Utility plans and Construction details are not designed to 100% level.
- Provide grading plan.
- Indicate whether Fresno St and G St are designed to Caltrans HDM or AASHTO standards.
- Show a typical section at G Street bent 1 in the median and potential CHSR bent 1 in the median.
- Typical Sections' STA "FFS" 11+18.00 TO 12+00.00 Lt and STA "FFS" 11+50.00 TO 12+00.00 Rt. Is not consistent with the plans.
- Typical Sections' STA "FFS" 10+25.00 to 10+53.74 Lt is not consistent with the plans. Show pedestrian railings.



- NOTE 1 on X-3 does not apply to G Street. Typical Section is inconsistent with what is shown on the layout sheet
- Show proposed cut/fill lines for G Street. Furthermore, provide grading plans should be provided for Fresno St and G St.
- Indicate assumed depth of HST structure and minimum vertical clearance. Confirm adequate clearance.
- Indicate Fresno St underpass on profile and the minimum vertical clearance from top of pavement to the structure soffit of G St.
- Conform point for G Street on profile sheet is shown at STA 30+25.00 while plan shows STA 30+00.
- Width of sidewalk on G Street is inconsistent with that shown on CHSTP reference drawing CV-T1024.
- Roadway elevations of G Street are higher than that shown on CHSTP reference Drawing CV-T1026.

Construction Details Comments

- Construction Details Sheet C-1: Confirm if concrete median shall be extended up to pedestrian cross walk line to match existing condition.
- Construction Details Sheet C-4: Sta. "FSS" 10+25, Left Face of Curb elevation 266.26 is incorrect.
- Construction Details Sheet C-1 to C-4: Provide spot elevations for sidewalk grading to make sure they are ADA compliant.
- Construction Details Sheet C-3: Confirm FL elevation 266.78 Lt at Sta. 14+50.00.
- Construction Details Sheet C-4: Show centerline elevations along "FSS" line. Be consistent with Construction Detail Sheets.
- Construction Details Sheet C-7: confirm slope at detectable warning surface is 8% max, not 2% max as indicated.
- Construction Details Sheet C-7 to C-9: Provide Stationing of angle points, geometric data, or spot elevations for construction elements.

Drainage Comments

- Confirm whether 18" RCP (line 3b) has sufficient cover.
- Confirm the existing 18" RCP (southwest of MH 3a) would have enough cover to remain in place without additional protection.
- Show size of exist RCP (south of MH 2g).
- Legend is inconsistent with CHSTP CADD standards.
- Confirm no additional inlet and SD piping is required west of 4a and 5a.



- Drainage System 5, Revise FL 261.86 which connects to existing 15" RCP.

Utilities

- Note 1: Reference to "Engineer" shall be modified to "Authority Representative" to match the language used in HST contract package 1.
- Note 3: Reference to costs is not appropriate as this work will be advanced as a DB lump sum contract.
- Note 10: Consider revising note for clarification. If something needs to be deleted from the plans why show it in the first place.
- Drainage quantities are for reference and not as basis for bid.
- Note 1: Reference to Others shall be changed to the contractor.
- Revise note 2 to: Contractor to coordinate the relocation of utilities in conflict with utility owners.
- Note 3: Delete "HIGH RISK". All utilities need to be potholed prior to construction.
- No information is included that indicates the utilities that need to be relocated.
- HST stationing on all Caltrans prepared drawings do not match actual HST stationing established by the Authority in the area.

Detour Plans

- Detour Plan may be acceptable for a standalone project but it may not work when this project is incorporated with the rest of activities in CP1.

